

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
AT WINCHESTER

LAUREN EWING,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

VGW, LTD.; VGW HOLDINGS US, INC.;  
VGW US, INC.; VGW LUCKYLAND, INC.;

*Defendants.*

No. 4:23-cv-062-KAC-SKL

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Defendant VGW's<sup>1</sup> Unopposed Motion to Extend the Time to Respond to the Complaint [Doc. 3]. This case is one of several cases filed recently in the Coffee County Circuit Court against various entities (including VGW) who host online activities/games referred to as "social casinos." VGW and other defendants have removed several such cases to this Court, where they are all represented by the same counsel. The plaintiffs in the various removed cases are also represented by the same counsel. According to the defendants in the removed cases, the plaintiffs have indicated they plan to file motions to remand the cases back to state court.

VGW has not yet filed a responsive pleading or motion to Plaintiff Lauren Ewing's complaint in this case. In the instant motion, VGW asks that its deadline to respond to the complaint be extended "up through and until 30 days after the Court rules on Plaintiff's forthcoming motion to remand."<sup>2</sup> [Doc. 3 at Page ID # 39]. VGW contends the "requested

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendants refer to themselves collectively as "VGW." The named Defendants are VGW, Ltd.; VGW Holdings US, Inc.; VGW US, Inc.; VGW Luckyland, Inc. VGW indicates VGW, Ltd. is incorrectly named and should be identified as "VGW Holdings Ltd." [see Doc. 3 at Page ID # 38].

<sup>2</sup> Substantively identical motions have been filed by the defendants in many, if not all, of the removed cases.

extension will conserve the resources of the Court and the parties.” *[Id.]*. VGW indicates Plaintiff Ewing has agreed to this extension.

The Court finds the extension VGW requests is not justified by the current record. VGW has not shown good cause for an extension that amounts to a stay of all proceedings pending resolution of a forthcoming motion to remand at this juncture. Nevertheless, an extension of the deadline to respond to the complaint will serve the interests of justice and efficiency, and preserve the Court’s and the parties’ resources, especially given the number of related cases which are being removed on a rolling basis.

Accordingly, VGW’s motion [Doc. 3] is **DENIED**. VGW **SHALL** respond to Plaintiff’s complaint on or before **JANUARY 22, 2024**. If counsel for Defendant removes additional cases to this Court or if Plaintiff’s counsel files similar claims in this Court, they **SHALL** mark such claims as related to the earliest filed case, 4:23-cv-055-CLC-SKL.

SO ORDERED.

ENTER:

*s/ Susan K. Lee*  
SUSAN K. LEE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE